

NOV 13 1926

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, NO. 5

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1926

WHOLE NO. 535

SECOND LATIN BOOK

By Ullman and Henry

Uniform with the Authors' successful ELEMENTARY LATIN

This volume of 505 pages meets every recommendation of the American Classical League for the reorganization and enrichment of the second year.

The chief features are a review of beginning Latin in lesson form through the medium of two continued stories entitled "A Roman Family" and "Two Roman Students"; selections, carefully simplified and graded, from various Latin authors, especially Livy, Eutropius, and Pliny; selections from the seven books of Caesar's *Gallic War* giving the most interesting parts of the narrative, with summaries in English of all omitted parts; easy graded passages adapted for Sight or Supplementary Reading; Thought Questions; and Vocabulary Drills. The total amount of text included in the Four Parts exceeds six books of Caesar, thus allowing wide range of choice. The Word Studies and other features which have proved so popular in the authors' ELEMENTARY LATIN have been continued in their SECOND LATIN BOOK.

There are 166 illustrations, several of them in color. In scope and attractiveness, as well as in modernity of ideas and pedagogical helps and hints, this book is without an equal.

Price \$1.68

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

Dallas

San Francisco

FOR ADVANCED HIGH SCHOOL CLASSES IN LATIN

Frieze and Dennison's Virgil's Aeneid. Complete. Revised..... \$2.00

Virgil's Aeneid. First Six Books. Revised..... 1.68

A modernized edition of this standard work. Critically revised in the light of recent Virgilian interpretations. All classical references carefully explained in the notes. Long vowels marked in the first two books. Text edition, \$.60.

Gleason's A Term of Ovid, with Sight Readings. Revised..... \$1.12

Edited especially for Secondary School pupils. First three selections given in both poetry and prose to introduce the pupil to the reading of Latin poetry. Revised to meet College Entrance Board Requirements.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA



D'OOGE AND ROEHM'S JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS

Vitalized lessons are handsomely presented in this new book which fully accords with the recommendations of the Classical Investigation.

Forty-eight lessons for the first half-year and fifty-three for the second, make a course that can easily be completed in a year without discouragement.

Illustrations and colored plates add to the appeal of the attractive format.

Catalogue price \$1.36

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston
Atlanta

New York
Dallas

Chicago
Columbus

London
San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 5

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1926

WHOLE NO. 535

THE AULULARIA OF PLAUTUS, IN LATIN, AT HAMILTON COLLEGE¹

The Latin Club of Hamilton College gave a public performance in Latin of the Aulularia of Plautus on May 21, under the direction of Professor Cleveland K. Chase. It has become a Hamilton custom for the Club to produce a play in Latin once every three years, so that there shall always be in the College one class that is familiar with the dramatic tradition.

The Latin Club, composed of about twenty students, has always included among its members some of The Charlautans, the local undergraduate dramatic organization. Naturally, costumes and other theatrical properties used in one play are preserved for subsequent performances; and each production has added to the skill and the technical knowledge of the energetic *choragus* and *dominus gregis*. Professor Chase, very wisely, I think, concentrates his efforts on developing smooth, fluent diction, clear enunciation, natural phrasing, a proper regard for the emotional content of the lines, and suitable stage-business, in short, on the dramatic essentials of the plays. In his interpretation of the Aulularia as a play for acting he deserves nothing but praise. The stage, at one end of the College gymnasium, was rather small, and at times seemed crowded. The scenic background was simple, but adequate. The actors for the major rôles were well chosen; the Plautine Latin sounded like a living language; the humor and the pathos were most convincing. While no attempt was made to scan the lines, the careful and natural phrasing produced rhythm without monotony, and enabled the spectator to enjoy the humor, the characterization, and the action. The very formal perfection of the famous Harvard performance of the Phormio, in 1894, a perfection achieved at great cost of time, money, and effort, has doubtless discouraged others from attempting to repeat in detail the labors of Professors Greenough, Allen, Morgan, and Howard.

The Aulularia is an unusually good drama for acting, amusing, of simple plot, and with several well-drawn character parts. Although the closing scenes of the play are lost, yet by the use of a modern Latin supplement, by Urceus, a professor at Bologna, printed in the edition of Bothe, the action is brought to the inevitable dénouement, adumbrated in the *periocha*. While the modern ending, as one could not fail to perceive, lacked the true Plautine flavor and exuberance, being

rather mechanical and overambitious, it served its purpose.

On the chief rôle, that of the miser Euclio, the success of the play depends. The actor has to speak nearly one-half the lines and is constantly on the stage; what is more, he must be a good impersonator. The student cast for this part was a Sophomore, Seymour Pitcher (was there an *omen* in his *nomen*?), who had never acted before. For an amateur actor he was truly remarkable. His rendition of the highly emotional, pathetic ninth scene of the fourth act, beginning *Perii, interii, occidi* (712), which brings the action to its climax, was artistic and thrilling.

If the College professor cannot present a play in Latin, he should at least try to see one performed. I can bear testimony to the incalculable benefit that comes to the readers and teachers of Plautus and Terence from the practical knowledge of dramatic technique that can be learned from careful attention to performances like that of the Aulularia.

UNION COLLEGE,
SCHEECTADY, N. Y.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

SCIENTIST AND HUMANIST IN HOMERIC CRITICISM²

(or, *Tendencies in Homeric Criticism*)

Tennyson, near the end of his life, said to a friend that he hoped his poetry would not be made a textbook in Schools. He forgot that this is the inevitable fate of all great poetry. As soon as a poem becomes literature, it is added to the store of human thought with which succeeding generations must be made familiar. Hence comes the first need of criticism. For to the child, as to the man of Ethiopia, the question will always be, "Understandest thou what thou readest?", and the answer will ever be, "How can I, except some man shall guide me?" As the teacher is to the child, so is the critic to the world of men who read poetry. He is the interpreter between the poet and all the audiences except the one which the poet immediately addresses. He performs the function of a liaison officer, bridging the gap in time and place, in race and social conditions. Above all he is a literary rheostat, transforming the current of the poet's thought into the potential which his remoter public can utilize.

Unfortunately, ideas cannot be carried intact from one mind to another through any intermediary. The critic colors them with his own personality. As the scope of criticism widens, the poet's ideas are handled more and more freely, according to the demands of the time and the peculiar mental twist of the critic. Liter-

¹In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7.10-12 Professor Chase himself gave an account of the performance, in Latin, of the Captivi of Plautus, on June 20, 1913, at Hamilton College. He set forth also the aims he keeps in view in these performances. In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 10.24 I referred briefly to the performance of the *Menaechmi*, at Hamilton, on June 16, 1916. In 17.8 Professor Catharine Saunders, of Vassar College, described the performance of the *Mostellaria* of Plautus at Hamilton, on May 18, 1923. C. K. >

²This address was delivered at a meeting of The New York Classical Club, at Columbia University, February 6, 1926.

ature has been the chief medium of academic instruction. As scholarship developed from the need of teaching and the demands of culture, literary ideas have been put to all uses in the laboratory of intellectual effort. This gives to criticism a most important part in the history of civilization, and makes it worth while to examine the way in which it has performed its duty.

The criticism of Homer offers the best material for this examination, for two reasons. First, Homer is the bedrock of Western literature, our ultimate literary fact. Neither Aristotle in his *Poetics* nor Horace in his *Ars Poetica* tries to go back of Homer. Secondly, Homer is also the greatest literary fact in the Western world. That needs no proof. Let the doubter glance at the index of any general work on literature. A history of Homeric criticism would be a good handbook of literary criticism.

In the criticism of Homer there have been two distinct tendencies which may be called, for want of better terms, scientific and humanistic. The scientist, as I use the term, looks at truth as a thing according to nature, and at man as one of the expressions of nature, a sort of mechanism, whose workings, being based on natural law, can be understood and described as any other phenomenon is understood and described. To the scientist an idea is a cold intellectual fact which can be abstracted from life and studied by itself. Poetry is objective material for the practice of the scientific method, and the end of this method is a definite formula, a law which describes the systematic working of a human mind. The humanist, on the other hand, regards truth as being qualified by its relation to man. To him man is in some way beyond nature, no matter how he came to be so. There are overtones in man which cannot be reduced to formulae by the study of many particulars. The poet is the superman in whom the overtones are so predominant that he is to be regarded as *sui generis*, a being whose laws can be described only in terms of a measure contained within himself, and not in nature.

Homeric criticism has swung from humanism to science and back again with a rhythm which can be traced with a certain degree of definiteness. Down to Aristotle it was mainly humanistic, that is, the Homeric poems were interpreted and judged in their bearing on human life and thought. The chief exception was due to the educational method of the Sophists, which used poetry as its material and aimed to develop the argumentative ability of its followers. Hence all sorts of difficulties were discovered in the Homeric Poems. Aristotle devotes a chapter to the methods of clearing these away. One Zoilus, who gathered these supposed inconsistencies into a book, went so far that either he or his book was called *The Scourge of Homer*. Aristotle himself was a humanistic critic of Homer, but as organizer and systematizer of all knowledge he gave a scientific direction to the intellectual movement of the following centuries, and to some extent determined the character of Homeric criticism.

The foundation of the library at Alexandria did more. It created the need for a standard text, and this

was the first aim of the great Alexandrian scholars. The great critics either expunged suspected passages, or else, like Aristarchus, marked them with an obelus. Aristarchus, although a Unitarian, accepted many longer interpolations, and was chiefly a scientific critic, giving far less attention to literary values than Aristotle had. This attitude of mind and the longer interpolations which he accepted laid the foundation of the modern school of disintegrating criticism.

After the giants of criticism came the Epigoni, imitators and followers of the great scholars, using their methods, but lacking their originality. The four greatest of these were Aristonicus, Didymus, Herodian, and Nicanor. Of these the first two alone really concern the present discussion, for they gathered and interpreted the critical remarks of Aristarchus and other great critics. The work of all four, however, forms the basis of the chief Homeric scholia which we possess. But the method exemplified by Zoilus and the reasons given by the Alexandrians for the acceptance of the longer interpolations resulted in a worrying of the Homeric corpus by a thousand literary jackals, who picked up any fancied contradiction and manufactured out of it a 'difficulty'. The dying out of great critical ability and the excesses of the method as pursued by little minds led to a reaction. The blemishes, real and imagined, began to have less attraction for the student of Homer, and the great beauties occupied the center of the critic's focus. The revival of the epic made Homer the well of inspiration rather than the quarry for imperfections. Horace, Dionysius, the writer *On the Sublime*, Quintilian, and Plutarch are all humanistic critics. The New School, which adopted this attitude toward Homer, took the field aggressively against the Old School, representing the Alexandrian tradition, and won in the general estimation of the world. Hence, although some grammarian of the sixth century took the pains to copy into a manuscript of Homer some extracts from the work of the four Epigoni, referred to above, the majority of those who busied themselves with the study of Homer during the Roman period were humanistic critics, finding the beauties, rather than the blemishes. The conclusions of the New School were summed up in the voluminous commentary on Homer by Eustathius, in the twelfth century. At the end of antiquity, therefore, Homer had triumphed against his antagonists.

The Renaissance was a period of creative activity, rather than a period of secondary or critical scholarship. It therefore fell in heartily, as well as unconsciously, with the view of Homer which had prevailed at the end of antiquity. It possessed the brief for the New School in the work of Eustathius; the brief for the Old School had not yet been brought to light.

The start of the pendulum in the other direction came with the discovery and publication of the Scholia (1788). For the next 100 years the scientific note in Homeric criticism was predominant. Again, as in Alexandria, the critical attitude of mind developed in response to the need for a better text: Wolf's Prolegomena, which gave the initial impetus to the new move-

ment, was written as the Introduction to a new edition of the text. The scientific criticism of the nineteenth century, like the Alexandrian study of Homer, was based largely upon the alleged discrepancies. Its procedure resembled the modern scientist's use of microscope, test tube, and dissecting knife. By the minute examination of thousands of infinitesimal details it came to a theory of the whole. But it went far beyond the Alexandrians in the thoroughness of its examination and in the scope of the details which it brought under examination. Aristarchus and his school had stopped with the excision of supposed interpolations and the marking of suspected passages. The nineteenth century critics added to this method another feature of scientific investigation which we find first in the early Greek philosophers. This was the adoption of some general hypothesis, based on pure theory or on some fact not immediately apparent in the poems themselves, for example, the assumption of Wolf that there was no writing in Homer's time, and the observed and assumed facts about heroic poetry in other races. The study of Homer became a tremendously active scholastic industry. The critic's laboratory was crowded with investigators. Criticism became what Saintsbury called "koskinomancy", divination by means of a sieve, the endeavor to bring back the soul of Homer or Homers by means of a philological screen, with meshes of countless sizes and ways innumerable of manipulating the sieve. Every possible detail of fact or assumed fact has been put into the test tube or under the microscope of the philologist. And for what purpose? To prove some new and different hypothesis about the origin and the growth of the poems.

The peak of the modern Alexandrian movement came about 1860. By that time Homer was regarded as a myth and his theme as the work of imagination. Sir Walter Scott had written,

Old Homer's theme is but a dream,
Himself a fiction too.

In 1860 the Greek heroic age was held to be nothing but the projection of fancy, the Greek conception of nature gods thrown against the dark background of a forgotten past.

The reaction began with Schliemann's discoveries, followed by those of Sir Arthur Evans, which assured us that the heroic period was, at least in its essence, historical. We are now apparently only at the beginning of the knowledge of just how historical it was. Within two years a Hittite document has been published², which seems to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the father of Agamemnon lived and commanded a powerful fleet not much more than a long human generation before the date which tradition assigned to the Trojan War. By the turn of the century, as we are now beginning to realize, the great philological epoch of modern times came at least to a pause, and its results began to

be submitted to examination. With the first ten years of the new century the Unitarian position grew in strength as the conclusions of the higher critics were examined more and more carefully. And no man has done more than Professor John A. Scott to produce the conviction that the conclusions of the scientific critics are founded on the shifting sands of incoherent details. The result is that the humanistic critics can no longer be laughed out of court. When scholars like Paul Shorey and A. T. Murray in America, T. W. Allen in England, A. Shewan in Scotland, and the late van Leeuwen, the great Dutch Hellenist, are all pronounced Unitarians, one cannot convincingly call Unitarians amateurs and fanatics. Of course the prestige of the Wolfians carries weight, and Wilamowitz in Germany and Gilbert Murray in England command a very considerable following; but the pendulum seems to be swinging rather strongly in the other direction.

We may sum up the results of this second Alexandrian period, now apparently drawing to a close, in some such formula as this. The higher criticism of Homer has given a great impetus to philological scholarship; it has sharpened our philological wits, and it has vastly increased our knowledge of the Homeric Poems. But it has not added a single item of information about the authorship of those poems, or even any convincing and generally accepted hypothesis about their composition. It has done Homer no little harm by unsettling the point of view from which his poems must be read by his modern public. The view of the plural or multiple authorship of Iliad and Odyssey which has slowly filtered down into the popular mind will take a long time to remove. But in scholarly circles the reaction toward the Unitarian position is rather strong. The question of one, two, or many Homers is at least an open one.

A very able Homerist of America, Professor G. M. Bolling, has reminded the Unitarians that their theory of Homer is just as hypothetical as that of the Wolfians. Let us therefore assume that there are two hypotheses, and that they are equally worthy of consideration, and let us examine the relative value of each: one Homer, many Homers. The first I call the humanist's hypothesis, the second the scientist's.

Whatever may be the objection to my names for these two theories, we must guard against likening them to the pair of contraries which one is likely to think of at once, fundamentalist and modernist. The humanist may accept tradition as indicating the truth, but he does so less because he believes in the accuracy of tradition than because he believes that what happens to be tradition accounts for the Homeric Poems better than any other theory accounts for them. Again, the humanist does not assume that we have the poems in the exact form in which the master poet left them. He admits that more modern spellings and forms of words have been substituted for the original, just as in some editions of the Faerie Queen and of Chaucer; and the papyri have shown how easy it was for unimportant verses to creep in and pad the original. Nor does the humanist discredit the discoveries of

²Published by Emil Forrer, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft*, 63 (March, 1924). <On the light which Hittite documents throw on matters with which the Homeric Poems deal see E. H. Sturtevant, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.174-175 (April 20, 1925). Professor Sturtevant there refers to this paper by Forrer. C. K. >

philological science. He merely holds that the scientist's method in its assumptions is not applicable to the problem, and that its conclusions are therefore unscientific, in the true sense, and valueless.

Let me illustrate by three books on the *Odyssey*², written from the Wolfian viewpoint, which have appeared within a year, by Schwartz, Dörpfeld, and Bérard. This might seem to indicate that the Unitarian position is being challenged with new power. But we find that these books are publications of views held in chief part by their authors at least a generation ago. They belong to the nineteenth, rather than to the twentieth century. Schwartz discovers unmistakable traces of five successive poets of the *Odyssey*, in a constantly diminishing order of poetic power, the last being a mere rhapsode and therefore almost beneath contempt, except that he alone put together the work of the other four into our *Odyssey*—for which he ought at least to have our gratitude! Bérard finds only three different poets, but adds the Homerids to assemble the work of these three. To Schwartz one version of the Vengeance of Odysseus is clearly seen to be the work of the first and greatest poet; to Bérard this story belongs to the decadence of epic poetry. Dörpfeld, on the other hand, in order to perfect his ingenious theory, must prove that the gem of the whole poem, the story of Odysseus's wanderings, is the work of a late *<and inferior>* poet. This sort of thing is typical of all the results of higher criticism. It leads the Unitarian to wonder whether after all the Wolfians are not the real fundamentalists. For they apply to their method the Hesiodic myth of gold, silver, bronze, and iron ages (of poets); and they have been so enthralled by the narrative of Odysseus that they have let their minds, like that hero's body, be carried off the map of reason into the fairyland of their imagination. What real value can there be in a method whose conclusions are an infinity of conflicting hypotheses?

A second reason for disbelief in the Wolfian theory on the ground of unscientific method is illustrated in the work of Bérard, who carries to the limit a feature of all higher criticism. Bérard treats the present poem as if it were some royal mummy, swathed by later and inferior poets in layer upon layer of wrappings. These wrappings he strips off for us one by one. Let me mention only a few of them. There is the beautiful drapery of the simile: this is late! So are the fine descriptions and all the lines which mention wealth and comfort. Strongly alliterative or assonant lines are but prettinesses of a degenerate age of poetry: off they come! There is the swathing of the neglected digamma: strip it off! One passage contains a rare word: out with it! But another has a strange word which is found in an original verse: it is mere imitation; away with it! One passage contradicts another: remove it! But here is a portion which resembles another passage: mere copying, amputate it!

But the humanist not only fails to be convinced by

such methods as these; he will not accept the principle on which they are based, namely, that the expression of the human spirit in language furnishes facts of the same kind as those which the senses perceive in nature. 'Wissenschaftliche Kritik' tries to introduce qualitative analysis into a field where, the humanist believes, the material was constantly changing under the myriad influences to which genius must always be sensitively reacting. Such 'Kritik' assumes that genius is static, instead of enormously kinetic and evasive of the observer.

This inadvertence of the higher critic is illustrated by the way in which for his purpose he must reduce Homer, or any one of his Homers, to a single point, a single mood or period of life or mental development. The humanist satisfactorily explains for himself the discrepancies and changes in outlook on the world which he finds in the Homeric Poems as due to vicissitudes in external circumstances and to periods in the spiritual growth of the long life of a poet. He compares the variety of spiritual stages through which Ste. Beuve and Anatole France passed. He thinks of *L'Allegro* and *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, all beyond question the work of a single poet. He finds nothing surprising or beyond his comprehension in the assumption that a great poet should have spent the greater part of a long life in giving shape to two poems whose unique tone and essential unity appear more clear to him with every reading.

Imagine Homer—the only poet that tradition connects with Iliad and *Odyssey*—to have been a divinely gifted youth, brought up in a school of bards, and early showing his towering superiority over all poets that were and that had been. Imagine this poet singing epic songs all his life, now with a burst of passion and superlative beauty of expression, again with less poetic power, composing some of his best songs in early youth, others in middle life, still others in old age. Suppose that the idea of two great poems came to him like a lightning flash from a thunder cloud, and that this idea became the ruling passion of his life. His experiences, moods, and views of life would change. He would work his poems over and over, and never finish them to suit him. Remember what Thucydides did with his *History* and Plato with his *Republic*. The Homer that we are picturing to ourselves would insert episodes and remove them, over and over again. Some of the additions and insertions, made ten or twenty years after the first of his versions, we may suppose, would not fit so well as others, because the poet was a little out of touch with that part of his work. As the poet grew older he would naturally use slightly different language and syntax; his views of gods and of the world would suffer modifications, and his interest would pass from one field to another. Is not this hypothesis as reasonable as the hundreds put forth by higher critics, all more or less conflicting, and each theory so full of holes that the unassisted eye can see them?

The humanist can not see why Homer should not have drawn on as large a store of sources as Shake-

²E. Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (Munich, Hueber, 1924); W. Dörpfeld and H. Rüter, *Homer's Odyssee in ihrer Urgestalt* (Munich, Buchenau and Reichert, 1924); Victor Bérard, *Introduction à L'Odyssee. Tomes I-III* (Paris, 1925. For a review of this work, by A. Shewan, see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.185-192).

speare, for example, did. He differs from the higher critics at this point only in asserting with all the vehemence of a profound conviction that there is no evidence whatsoever for any conclusion either as to the nature of these sources or as to the changes through which in the alembic of genius they were transformed into the constituent elements of Iliad and Odyssey. So it is one of the keystones of the humanist position that the quest after these sources is neither logical nor profitable. Nor profitable! The tendency of the higher critic's philosophy is to go soaring into the clouds of fantastic theory, instead of following the example of Socrates, and making that philosophy useful to men.

Let me point out some of these unprofitable results.

The first is a double standard of truth. Gildersleeve was not a Unitarian, but he believed that in introducing the student to Homer one should adopt the Unitarian view. This is an intellectual straddle that seems unfortunate.

Again, think what is implied in the conclusions of the higher critics. How can there be anything beautiful in a thing of shreds and patches? The ripper and raveler of what higher criticism regards as patchwork should at least put his work together so that we can see how much better it is than the original. But, instead, he usually messes the poems, and still calls that mess beautiful.

A critic should put his own audience into touch with his theme. Of what use is the Homeric critic if he does not enable the present world to 'tune in' on Homer? But judge a great edition like Leaf's by this standard. What is our impression after reading twenty pages of his Introductions or of his Notes or of his Companion? These words catch our eye: "weaknesses", "inconsistencies", "burlesque", "difficulties", "confusion", "accretions", "lack of unity", "inappropriateness", "strange expressions", "impotent conclusions", "more difficulties". One thinks of the comic scene in the Frogs of Aristophanes: 'Recite, Aeschylus', says Dionysus, 'and you, Euripides, look out for the blemishes!' That may do for comedy, but we do not want Homeric criticism to fall into that category. The Beaudilarian attitude toward life has been summed up in the words, "Oh, how happy I should be if I were only somewhere else!" This might apply with a slight change to the higher critics: 'Oh, how happy were the world if Homer had only been written differently!' Damning the Homeric poetry with faint praise is not constructive criticism. Croce objects to what he calls exclamatory critics, who utter honeyed interjections about a poet; but the denunciatory critic is not more praiseworthy, especially when hardly two such critics agree precisely on the exact point which arouses their scorn.

The reason for this disagreement, as well as the *reductio ad absurdum* of the most modern form of higher criticism, is to be found in Wilamowitz's book on the Iliad⁴. It seems probable that in time to come this work may be regarded as a sort of funeral oration of

what I have called the modern Alexandrian period. Wilamowitz adopts as the canon of the "Wissenschaftliche Methode" the '*feeling for style*'. This is as bad for criticism as the dictum of Protagoras, 'man the measure of all things', was for philosophy. It makes each critic the measure of Homer, of what is Homeric and what is not. The result is not so much the disintegration of Homer as it is the disintegration of Homeric criticism. This is why the lover of Homer is cheered by the progress of the Unitarian view. The humanistic critic is not an obscurantist. He will welcome any discovery that will make Homer mean more to the world, even if it disproves the critic's own theory. But he objects to making Homer the pawn in a philological game, the medicine ball for philological exercise. He believes that construction should take the place of destruction. For Wilamowitz's *feeling for style* he would substitute the demand for a *knowledge of style*. For this purpose he assumes that our Iliad and our Odyssey are in the larger sense Homeric. Then there is work for a generation or two of the best kind of philological scholarship, to determine precisely the implication and the connotation of the term Homeric as applied to style, by a minute analysis and an approach from many angles. This done, we can estimate the variations of style in the different parts of the poems, and we can judge whether these are so great as to compel the belief that many different poets were at work. But we must not prejudice the quest by assuming beforehand the truth of what we may or may not find. That obscures the trail.

It does more than this. For the chief defect of higher criticism, viewed pragmatically, its unpardonable sin, is the sin against the spirit of poetry. Renan says that the essence of criticism is the ability to enter modes of life different from our own. That means the ability to show us, not the factual constitution of poetry, but its dynamics. Our own senses and thoughts become blunted from use in the dull round of life. We see life mistily and in monochrome because we have injured the eyes of the imagination by using them to read the cold print of the world about us and its short-lived thoughts and ambitions and gratifications—a world that seems to be growing old! But it is our eyes that are aging, not the world. When we go hand in hand with the poet we are, as an English writer⁵ has recently said, like one leading a little child into the country. We see through his young eyes. The poet is like one of Plato's souls that dart back to earth after a thousand years amid the indescribably beautiful sights and experiences of heaven. His eyes can see the splendid sights and colors and magic landscapes that we have lost the power to behold. His ears can catch the overtones and the undertones of the human world that never grows old. So he creates for us a world of beautiful thought. He quickens our senses by stimulating them in a new way. And he does this in his own peculiar manner. No two poets can be alike in this. Until this measure of the difference between two poets is discovered, we cannot measure a poet except in so far as

⁴Die Ilias und Homer (Berlin, Weidmann, 1916), reviewed in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.110-112.

⁵L. A. Morrison, in A Day with the 'Golden Treasury', Adelphi (London, June, 1925).

we can know his surroundings and his history. Therefore we cannot, as Ste. Beuve said, 'Measure Homer'. Which then is the more profitable aim, to know Homer as a dynamic power, or to guess at him as a static fact, to seek for blemishes which must appear in the work of any mortal, or for the pure gold that only a few mortals have ever revealed? The effective critic must love his poet; he must admire him; he must believe in him. How else can he put the poet's audience of to-day in touch with his poetry? On the pragmatic ground alone the humanist may challenge the Wolfians to prove which is the 'higher' criticism.

We may now make a little sharper the real contrast between the two schools of Homeric criticism which I have called scientific and humanistic. The first locates the Homeric problem *before* the poems, the second *in* the poems themselves. The scientist aims to know what the humanist asserts is, with the present data, unknowable. The scientist seeks for Homer an immediate formula which shall explain the origin of the two great monuments of literature, Iliad and Odyssey. The humanist will be content if ultimately a formula, or at least a group of scientifically based principles, shall be found, sufficient to explain the Homeric spirit of poetry, so as to put this great and pure fountain head into effective connection with the literary and spiritual currents of to-day.

By their fruits ye shall know them. Of the Scourge of Homer only the title is left. The disintegrating comments of the great Alexandrian critics survive only in marginal and interlinear jottings of some conscientious, but unenlightened, grammarian. A century of modern scientific criticism has brought a great Homerist, Walter Leaf, to this conclusion:

To try to keep the level of interest in the Iliad from beginning to end is to most readers a disheartening task. It is my hope to point out the defects... and to show <how they arose> as a natural result of the conditions under which the Iliad came into existence.

This, I may remark, no living man can do, with our present data. Over against this conclusion put the words of Kinglake, in Eothen:

And all the while the strong vertical light of Homer's poetry is blazing so full upon the people and things of the Iliad that soon to the eyes of the child they become as familiar as his mother's shawl.

Let me quote also some words of the ancient humanists, the New School of Homeric criticism. Says Plutarch, after telling how Lysias, with all his charm, failed to please at the second reading (*De Garrulitate* 5):

'But Homer is ever new and always at the height of his power to charm'.

Says the writer of the treatise *On the Sublime* (33.4):

'I myself have noted not a few errors on the part of Homer and other great writers.... But granted that Apollonius shows himself a poet who does not slip: would you rather be Apollonius than Homer?'

And note this from Eustathius:

'The siren voice of Homer! Well perhaps for a man to keep from it entirely, with wax in his ears, or avoiding it in his journey. For if his way of life brings

it into his path, he cannot easily pass it by; and if he could pass it by, he would have no cause for gratitude'.

This is the view of Homer which prevailed when Petrarch died happy in the recovery of the poet's works. Think what the Renaissance might have been if the Alexandrians, rather than the New School, had coloured the vision of those who began to read Homer once more!

The shifting of the attitude of scholars toward Homer from science to humanism augurs well for the future. If we can only *use* Homer! Think what he has done for literature in Greece, in Rome, and in the Western world since the revival of learning! But Homer must be known if the wonderful potential of his poetry is to be transformed into power in the minds of coming poets and writers of America. We are trying to get mechanical power out of our rivers. We spend millions for that. But we neglect this exhaustless source of literary inspiration. 'As from ocean, says the proverb, come all fountains and rivers and wells of water, so from Homer, if not all, yet a great stream of literary influence has augmented the power of all men of culture' (so says Eustathius, in the Introduction to his *Commentary on the Iliad*, page 1, lines 7-8). What right has this country, with its unbounded wealth, to deny to the more gifted High School students a chance to put themselves into immediate and close touch with this perennial source of poetic power? We are now in a period of great creative activity in the writing of verse. But unfortunately the material for this creative effort is taken from the present, from unstable, untested ideas, from the output of the mine of human experience which contains more dross than gold. We have all but lost poetic influences of high potential, especially Homer, greatest of all. Where is the Petrarch who will bring Homer back to America and usher in a new Renaissance?

Not long ago Gilbert Murray, one of the greatest of modern higher critics of Homer, published an article on Homer, in a New York literary review. My English colleague, after reading it, sent it to me with a pencilled comment. The title was *The Secret of Homer*, and in the margin my colleague had written the words, "Well kept". The higher critics have failed to find the secret of Homer. It is only fair that the humanists should have their turn in hunting for it.

When the Alexandrian view of Homer was going out of vogue, Lucian, in his *True History*, tells of meeting the soul of Homer, and of asking him about the passages rejected by Zenodotus and Aristarchus. And Homer replied that he wrote them all. To-day, if he were asked about the conclusions of the modern Alexandrian movement of the nineteenth century, I think he would answer differently. An English schoolmaster, J. D. Lester, poet and lover of Homer, has told us what I think the poet would say:

And the poet replied with a dignified air:

"What the digamma does anyone care?"

And he sat and he sang by the winedark sea

A book or two more of his *Odyssey*.

The poet has been singing his way into the hearts of men for centuries after centuries; the only secret of

Homer which is worth discovering is how to make his song sing itself into the hearts of the poets and lovers of poetry of the immediate future in America.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

REVIEWS

Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism. By Donald Lemen Clark. New York: Columbia University Press (1922). Pp. x + 166.

In the volume entitled *Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance*, Dr. D. L. Clark, Assistant Professor of English in Columbia University, traced the influence of the classical theories of rhetoric on the criticisms of poetry in English literature from the publication of Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*, in 1553, to that of Ben Jonson's *Timber*, in 1641. On page 3 he declares that "... The interpretation of the critical terms used by the literary critics of the English renaissance must depend largely on the classical tradition". This tradition came both directly, from classical authors, and indirectly, through the intermediation of Italian scholars. The indebtedness to Italian scholars is well known. In the present study Dr. Clark hoped to show (4) that the English critics were more indebted than had been supposed to the medieval development of classical theory, and that

the English critics who formulated theories of poetry in the renaissance derived much of their critical terminology, not directly from the rediscovered classical theories of poetry, but through various channels from classical theories and practice of rhetoric.

Dr. Clark divides his book into two parts, *The General Theory of Rhetoric and Poetic* (5-100), and *The Purpose of Poetry* (103-161). The Index covers pages 163-166.

The first part falls logically into two divisions: first, a survey of classical poetic and rhetoric, their blending and contamination in antiquity, with the medieval continuation of the classical tradition (10-55); and, second, the preservation or survival of these theories in the English renaissance (56-100). It is only on the first part that the present reviewer feels competent to give an opinion.

The survey of classical rhetoric and poetic is, on the whole, well done. There is, however, a dangerous tendency to use secondary authorities. So, e. g., on page 24, Hermagoras is cited from the Introduction to Wilkins's edition of Cicero, *De Oratore*, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus from Cope's Introduction to his edition of the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle. There are, however, no serious errors in statement. The reference to twenty-six "books" of Aristotle's *Poetics* is doubtless only a slip of the pen, and if Cicero's famous statement of the aim of the orator as *docere, delectare, movere* appears in an altered form on page 136, no great harm is done (it is rightly given on page 50). The treatment of classical theory is sound and fully sufficient for the work in hand.

As for the second division of the first part of the

book, which deals with the use of classical terms in the English renaissance, it must suffice to give a short summary of Dr. Clark's views. In the Middle Ages, the term 'rhetoric' acquired the meaning 'adornment of style', or 'aureate language', a meaning which it still possesses to-day except when it is used in a technical sense. Under this conception rhetoric and poetic were merged, rhetoric taking care of beauty of style. In England, this theory, inherited from the Middle Ages, persisted until the seventeenth century, when, with the recovery of classical literature and literary criticism, the new theories were interpreted in the light of the old ideas (99).

In the second part of the book, dealing with *The Purpose of Poetry* (103-161), Dr. Clark outlines the classical theories that poetry brings improvement by precept and by example, and secondarily by allegory. The allegorical interpretation survived in the Middle Ages and into the period of English literature under consideration, and was adopted by the less scholarly critics. On the other hand, the more scholarly critics, such as Jonson and Sidney, applied to poetry the canons of classical rhetoric which they derived in part from the rediscovered Classics themselves, in part from the critics of the Italian renaissance. Here the details of the treatise under review are of interest primarily to the students of English literature. Some thirty authors are cited; many are discussed with great learning and acumen.

To the classical scholar the chief interest of the book is in its revelation of another of the many points at which the stream of classical tradition touches modern thought.

YALE UNIVERSITY

HARRY M. HUBBELL

Collectanea Alexandrina. Reliquiae Minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323-146 A. C. Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum, Cum Epimetris et Indice Nominum Edidit Iohannes U. Powell. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch (1925). Pp. xx + 263. \$9.50.

In his *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Mr. Powell has sought first to bring together the fragments of Alexandrian poets who wrote epic poetry, elegiac poetry, lyric poetry (in the more restricted sense), and ethical poetry, with the exception of those poets in these classes of whom we have a considerable body of work. In the second place, he has meant to bring together many writers whose extant remains, hitherto, have been almost inaccessible, because they have been to seek in rare, out of the way books, sometimes in books almost unobtainable.

The contents of the book are as follows:

Praefatio (vii-x); Ordo Poematum (xii-xiv); Index Scriptorum (xv-xvi); Tituli Poematum (xvii-xix); Index Originum Recentium (xx); Textus *<Cum Adnotationibus>* (1-245); Addenda (245); Epimetra (246-252); Index Nominum *<Graecorum>* et Adiectiorum Propriorum (253-263).

As one turns over the pages he notes such names as Nicaenetus (1-3), Rhianus (9-21), Euphorio, a name of

interest and importance to students of Latin poetry (28-58), Eratosthenes (58-68), Alexander Aetolus (121-130), Paean Delphicus I Anonymi in Apollinem (141-148), Paean Delphicus II et Prosodium in Apollinem (149-159), Hymnus Curetum (160-162), Cercidas (201-213), etc.

The two Delphic Hymns are presented in several ways. First the text is given, so far as it can be made out, in ordinary Greek type, without any additional markings. Then the text is printed again, "secundum indicia lapidum, quibus duplicatio musica syllabarum, diphthongorum solutio, notae musicae, exhibentur"; in other words, the Greek text is given with the musical notation. Finally, the text is given a third time, in modern musical notation (after Reinach), above which are set the musical markings found on the stones.

The material in the book is made available by divers Indexes.

Those who desire a more detailed review of the book may read what is said of it by Mr. A. D. Knox, in *The Classical Review* 30.190-193 (November-December, 1925), and by Professor Paul Shorey, in *Classical Philology* 20.348-349 (October, 1925). Both reviewers praise the book highly. Mr. Knox says (191), "For three reasons—for the completeness of the work, for a most diligent study of all relevant publications, and for Mr. Powell's own acute...scholarship—everyone will feel grateful". Professor Shorey tells us that "Merely to trace the chief texts to their sources one must draw from a university library twenty or thirty volumes. And a verification of all the editor's references to the modern scholarship of his subject would call for hundreds more. Mr. Powell seems to have noted and considered everything relative to his theme". Again he says, "...all the evidence is presented, and the work too carefully done for anything but hypercriticism to pick serious flaws in it". He sums up by saying, "Mr. Powell and the Oxford Press have given us a book which it will be a delight to use, and which no scholar who can afford to buy it can afford to do without".

CHARLES KNAPP

Primitive Culture in Greece. By H. J. Rose. London: Methuen and Company; New York: George H. Doran Company (1925). Pp. ix + 245.

Primitive Culture in Greece, by Professor H. J. Rose, is a remarkably well written book. Its purpose is to show how much of the primitive element was left in classical Greece. The author, a Canadian scholar, is known principally through his important work, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch, A New Translation, With Introductory Essays and Running Commentary* (Oxford University Press, 1924).

The contents of *Primitive Culture in Greece* are as follows:

- I. To Avoid Misunderstandings (1-21); II. The Greek Peoples (22-37); III. Survivals Falsely so Called (38-64); IV. Survivals of the Primitive—I. The Gods (65-88); V. Survivals of the Primitive—II. Heroes and Ghosts (89-108); VI. Birth, Marriage and Death (109-133); VII. Magic and Mythology (134-162); VIII. The State, the Clan and the Family (163-188); IX. The Development of Jurisprudence (189-214); X. Arts and Crafts, Trade. Conclusion (215-235); Bibliography (236-238); Index (239-245).

In his Preface, the author modestly dedicates the work, not to the expert in anthropology or in Greek, but to the general reader. It is true that the diction of the work is simple, lucid, and unadorned; but it is hard to see in this instance how the scholarly element is at all slighted thereby. Footnotes are indeed lacking, but the source-material of each chapter is indicated at its end. Naturally, Mr. Rose has profited by the researches of such scholars as Frazer, Glotz, and Nilsson, but his treatment of the several topics is strikingly free and independent, and he frequently finds occasion to differ with the first two; with the Swedish authority he is almost invariably in accord.

It must be as depressing to the ultramodernist as it is refreshing to the classicist to find that Mr. Rose clearly demonstrates that the civilized world of to-day has, at best, travelled away from the darkness of primitive barbarism but a short step farther than had the Greeks of the age of Pericles. The genuinely primitive, the author concludes, lies a great distance back of Hellenic culture.

The book is replete with bits of curious and recondite information, and the author spares no pains in his attempt to stimulate the imagination of his reader and to suggest new avenues of thought. He stresses his belief (19, 84) that the savage compels his women to work the fields from his confidence in the natural power of incitement to fertility which is resident in the female. One wonders how far the question of sloth may here be taken into consideration. However, the reviewer recalls how, in his younger days, he used to wonder why the farmers in Eastern Canada, preparatory to the business of sowing wheat, refused to "take the grain" from any but a female member of the household. A practice of this sort, occurring as it did in communities by no means backward intellectually, would certainly suggest something in the nature of a primitive survival. Very interesting likewise are Mr. Rose's observations on such topics as the primitive reason for closing the eyes during prayer, and the primitive estimates of the relative weights of a person in a normal state of mind and in a rage. In the first instance, the worshipper closes his eyes out of dread of actually beholding the deity who is invoked, as Moses put a veil before his face when he conversed with Jehovah. To the barbaric mind the angry man is heavier than the calm, for his rage weighs the former down as water does a drenched cloak.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY
ALFRED, NEW YORK.

A. D. FRASER

WHITEWASHING THE ANCIENTS

Professor Odgers's very informing and entertaining article on Whitewashing Certain of the Ancients, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.143-148, overlooks one lively defence of Tiberius which is none the less interesting for being the work of a novelist-dilettante rather than of a classical scholar. This is the chapter on Tiberius in Mr. Norman Douglas's fascinating *Siren Land*. Mr. Douglas covers familiar ground in his usual sprightly and belligerent style. He seems to have read much on the subject.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

BEN C. CLOUGH